

BEDFORD PLANNING BOARD
Selectmen's Room
Minutes
October 11, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jeffrey Cohen, Chair; Sandra Hackman; Shawn Hanegan; Amy Lloyd; Lisa Mustapich, Clerk

STAFF PRESENT: Tony Fields, Director of Planning; Catherine Perry, Assistant Planner; Kim Siebert, Recording Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: David Bernstein, Developer 614-616 Springs Road; Aaron Bourret, 8 Glen Ora Dr; Carolyn Carbone, 38 Buehler Rd; Daniel Carr, Stamski and McNary (Evergreen LLC); Brian DeVellis, landscape architect/land use attorney for 614-616 Springs Road; Caroline Fedele, Selectman; Margot Fleishman, Selectman; Richard Madison, 29 Fox Run Rd; Bryan Melonson, 607 Main St, Woburn (Evergreen LLC); Alan Nelson, 25 Fox Run Rd; David Powell, FinCom; Eliza Rosenberry, The Bedford Citizen; Annemarie Weicker, 27 Fox Run Rd.

The Emergency Evacuation notice was read by Lisa Mustapich, Clerk.

Note: All meeting submittals are available for review in the Planning Office

ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT PUBLIC HEARING

Motion: At 7:35, Mr. Hanegan moved to open the public hearing. Ms. Lloyd seconded. The motion passed, 5-0-0.

As stated in the public meeting notice, the purpose of the Public Hearing was to “review an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw, prior to the fall Special Town Meeting. The proposed change would establish a temporary moratorium on Medical Marijuana Treatment Centers, to allow the Town time to study and consider whether, where and under what conditions to allow such uses.” Ms. Mustapich read the notice, in its entirety, into the record. The temporary moratorium question appears in the STM Warrant for November 9, 2016 as Article 3.

Chair Cohen noted a memo in hand from Planning Staff, providing detail re: the proposed moratorium. Selectman Margot Fleischman and Planning Director Fields also gave context and background to the matter, saying that current zoning bylaws allow MMTCs as a retail use, by right in the General Business and Limited Business zones (two areas on Great Road and one on North Road) and by special permit in the Residential D District (on Hartwell Road).

Article 3 was prompted by an inquiry into a Great Road location submitted earlier this year by a medical marijuana provider. The inquiry did not go forward because that particular location was within a 500 ft. setback of a school, daycare center or facility in which children commonly congregate such as a playground, library, park, or athletic field/facility—a stipulation included in State regulations on MMTCs. However, Mr. Fields said it was probably only a matter of time before another inquiry would be received.

Mr. Fields said the question comes down to whether citizens object to a facility on a main street where anyone—including children—can see it. This is allowed under current zoning. If voters don't object to MMTCs on the main roads, they can simply vote "No" on Article 3 at STM. If voters agree there should be time to consider zoning and related questions, they would vote "Yes."

If Article 3 passes, the follow-up action for the Planning Board would be to recommend a zoning bylaw amendment at STM 2017. To discuss zoning amendments and other conditions governing MMTCs, the Town could form a broad-based group that included multiple Town departments and, perhaps, other representative parties. The Attorney General does not generally allow moratoria for more than twelve months.

Mr. Hanegan asked whether a "letter of non-opposition" from the Town, as required for MMTCs, would be one of the outcomes of the discussions. Mr. Fields said that each MMTC State application requires a letter of support or non-opposition.

MMTCs cannot be banned outright but Mr. Fields reported that some towns only allow MMTCs via special permit. If every permitted zone is disqualified because of proximity to a place frequented by children, a town would be not be in compliance with the law allowing MMTCs.

Ms. Lloyd asked if there is information available about the kinds of locations vendors and patients prefer. Mr. Fields said that, to date, vendors have looked for towns that provide the least resistance. As for patrons, they prefer not to be stigmatized. Ms. Perry added that patrons may want easy access in safe, secure, well-lit areas and police may find it harder to oversee facilities off the beaten path. As the market matures, vendors are likely to want locations that are close to highways since that provides access from a larger catchment area. Mr. Fields said, because some MMTCs are already open in other towns, there is an opportunity to examine such factors as the effects on traffic and surrounding neighborhoods.

Given the number of unanswered questions about MMTCs, Ms. Mustapich said pausing to study the issues makes sense. Members of the audience were asked to comment but no one rose to speak to the matter.

Ms. Lloyd asked if the Selectmen would manage/drive the process. Selectman Fedele said there had been, so far, only a "generic conversation" about the process but there is a sense that a multi-party study group should be convened. Ms. Fleischman said the Selectmen would rely on staff to begin the process by analyzing what specific subjects the study group should address.

Ms. Lloyd said she assumed that the Board of Health would be involved in the study group but she hopes BOH members will do "significant research" to become fully educated on MMTCs and on marijuana itself. "This is such a hot button topic that it's critical for all of us to have our ducks in a row because it has the potential of becoming a real problem on Town Meeting floor when people's emotions will be involved."

Ms. Hackman expressed concern that Planning staff will have to do significant work to move this process forward and that Planning would be expected to answer questions on TM floor. Ms. Lloyd agreed and asked who, specifically, would present Article 3 at STM. Mr. Cohen clarified that the Planning Board's role at this point is merely to make a recommendation on the proposed

moratorium. Ms. Fleischman concurred and said that the Selectmen would present the article. Motion: Ms. Lloyd moved to close the public hearing. Ms. Mustapich seconded. The motion passed, 5-0-0.

The Board discussed whether or not to recommend approval of Article 3.

Mr. Cohen agreed that giving the Town time to consider the matter is a positive move. Ms. Mustapich said she was in favor of Article 3 because the scope of article is “very narrow” and allows time for study but doesn’t discuss locations or the pros and cons of marijuana use. Mr. Hanegan agreed. Ms. Lloyd said she is also in favor of Article 3 and believes the moratorium will force a needed conversation.

Motion: Ms. Mustapich moved that the Planning Board recommend approval of Article 3 at Special Town Meeting to give the Town time to study and craft guidelines for the location of a Medical Marijuana Treatment Center. Ms. Lloyd seconded. The motion carried, 5-0-0.

DEVELOPMENT PERMITTING

614-616 Springs Road and 10 Green Street (land off Fox Run and Buehler roads): Continuation of Public Hearing to review a Planned Residential Development under Zoning Bylaw Section 9 and Subdivision Rules and Regulations

Materials submitted by the developer include: A five (5) page booklet of new conceptual plans for the off-Fox Run and off-Buehler Hybrid PRD development including three pages of new conceptual plans for off- Fox Run showing: (1) lot areas and street layout; (2) landscaping and tree placement; and (3) an aerial view of the layout; plus 2 off- Buehler documents showing (4) landscaping and tree placement, and (5) an aerial view of the layout.

Mr. Cohen opened the Public Hearing at 8:00 and read into the record the list of letters/emails the Planning Board received prior to the last session of the Public Hearing on September 27, 2016.

Mr. DeVellis re-oriented the Board and audience, saying the prior meeting had ended by taking a straw poll of members’ opinions on several items: a T or a cul-de-sac emergency turnaround (T turnaround preferred); keep as affordable or tear down the existing house at 614 Springs Road (keep if accepted by the Housing Partnership); inclusion of a duplex in the mix of houses off Fox Run (all single-family preferred by Board and neighborhood); “hybrid” PRD or conventional development (“hybrid” PRD). Tonight’s presentation was intended to be a brief update in response to the Board’s preferences:

- The T turnaround, now in the plan, gives adequate area for a firetruck turnaround and meets the NFPA1 standard;
- Houses on the Fox Run side are all 31+ feet apart, creating a similar “feel” to conventional developments;
- Keeping the existing house, the turn into Fox Run has been “cleaned up” by moving the driveway further away from the Springs Road intersection;
- The off-Fox Run houses are in two different footprints; one is 2,166 sq. ft. on the first floor (with garage) or 1,500 sq. ft. of living space on the first floor (without garage) plus

another 1,500 sq. feet on the second floor for a total of 3,000 sq. ft. of living space. The other footprint is slightly bigger with 2,195 sq. ft. on the first floor (with garage), then subtracting the garage and adding the second floor as above to calculate total living space;

- The new road length off Fox Run is about 411 linear feet to the end of the T. The intersection of that road and Fox Run is about 145 ft. from the Springs Road;
- The closest a new house will be is 102 ft. to the edge of pavement on Fox Run; the second closest is 145 ft;
- The plan is to “surgically” place the new houses into the landscape to the extent possible, as Ms. Mustapich recommended at the last meeting;
- Berms will be placed at the entrance to the new road;
- The development will have 5, distinctly created lots with landscaping in between;
- The five houses will have farmer’s porches facing the road and landscaping along the street;
- The exit of the new road has been angled so that headlights won’t intrude into the house across the street. Additional landscaping will add to the protection;
- This portion of the development will include a connection down to the narrow gauge trail/bike path;
- The suggestion to re-orient the Buehler homes to minimize grading and fill, as Ms. Lloyd suggested, resulted in what Mr. DeVellis called “worse grading impacts”. Therefore, the houses remain as previously oriented;
- The closest off- Buehler house is 58 ft. from the cul-de-sac; the two homes would be about 70ft. from each other;
- The off-Buehler lots are roughly an acre each with a common driveway;
- The off-Buehler houses would be sprinkler-equipped per order of the Fire Department.

Mr. DeVellis said that the landscaping plan would be fleshed out more fully once he obtained feedback from the Board that the proposal is on the right track.

Mr. DeVellis said the plan will go before the Conservation Commission at the end of October and the question of accepting the existing house as an affordable unit will be taken up by the Housing Partnership at an upcoming meeting. Developer Bernstein said he’d had a preliminary meeting with two members of the Partnership—Ms. Mustapich and Christina Wilgren. Mr. DeVellis added, whether the existing house stays or goes, the current proposal would remain similar to the plan presented tonight.

Ms. Mustapich said she anticipates a more detailed clearing line in subsequent presentations. She asked why there was a “double T” on the Buehler plans. Mr. DeVellis said it was in response to an abutter’s request to provide additional parking to prevent people from parking in the cul de sac.

Mr. Hanegan asked about open space calculations. Mr. DeVellis replied that the final tally has not been done because the current presentation is more conceptual. Mr. Hanegan asked again for a street view rendition of the Fox Run portion of the PRD to better understand what the neighbors will experience once the development is built.

Mr. Hanegan asked Planning staff to speak about how the Board might handle the bylaw stipulation re: mixed housing types in a PRD, given the cautions in Ms. Perry's memo. He recalled that at the last meeting, Board members were not anxious to keep the duplex. Ms. Perry replied that the Board should be aware that there is a risk of setting a new precedent by omitting the duplex, since previous PRDs have included at least a minimum number of attached units. Ms. Perry further explained that there isn't a general ability to waive zoning bylaws, unlike the Subdivision Rules and Regulations. It would be important to be clear about the circumstances that led to the decision. Ms. Perry said she could understand that the Board might feel a duplex would not contribute visually in this case, but normally, one reason to have a duplex is to reduce the cost a bit. You might feel that it's just not reasonable to impose the requirement for the mix of buildings given the size of this development. If you feel that this case is unusual and the purpose and intent of the bylaw are met—that it's creating a sufficient mix of types of dwellings without having to literally have different building forms—then you could justify that carefully, but not say you'll just waive the bylaw."

Mr. DeVellis said the bylaw doesn't specify that a duplex must be included, but acknowledged that it says "different types of buildings."

Ms. Hackman said the road extends into the 50ft. wetland buffer. Mr. DeVellis said that there's a 25 ft. "no touch" buffer and a 50 ft. "no structure" buffer. Roads and certain types of drainage infrastructure are allowed in the 50 ft. buffer but he said he could "tighten that up and pull it back toward Lot 3."

Ms. Hackman asked if there was a way to connect the existing Springs Road house to the rest of the development. Ms. Mustapich, who has toured the existing house property, reported that the distance from there to the new houses wouldn't be far. Ms. Lloyd said she wouldn't like to see someone in the future be able to erect an 8-foot fence between the existing house and the new development. Mr. DeVellis said the development team has no objection to keeping the existing house looking like part of the new development. "There's a series of spruce there now and the goal is to keep them. We can figure a way to integrate [the existing house] with landscaping."

Comments:

Ms. Lloyd said, when she first looked at the updated plan, her reaction was that the developers got everything they wanted but the Board didn't get what it wanted. "I am happy to concede the T, I'm happy to concede the parklet, I would be happy to concede a sidewalk—and you don't hear me say that very often. I think there is justification for allowing the lack of an attached house—this is very small and that neighborhood doesn't have that type of housing. But, what I don't see are the other things we asked for: there's no side garage—and there is room for a side garage if you edge these around... I'm seeing houses that are car-focused, not people focused."

But, Ms. Lloyd added, the above was not her main objection: "The [house] size is still too big. Our PRD states that it's intended to encourage conservation of more significant open space—which we do have—while at the same time providing for a greater mixture of housing types at somewhat greater density. What I'm seeing here is that you're getting 5 big houses where you'd normally get 4...A house of 2,200 sq. ft.—which was your original proposal—is an alternative type nowadays. And it's more in keeping with the neighborhood."

Ms. Lloyd asked Developer Bernstein about the house sizes he'd constructed elsewhere in town. He replied that the smallest house was about 3,400 sq. ft. and the average size is 4,000 or 4,200. Ms. Lloyd said this was similar to what the Board has seen from other developers.

Mr. DeVellis said they'd originally come in with a higher density proposal but given that up when the Board and neighbors said they preferred fewer houses. He added that side-loading garages would force the houses to be at least 60 ft. apart. "If the goal is to keep the development footprint as compact as possible, we can't [do it with side-loading garages.] We're trying to keep an attractive streetscape...I think this is a balance of everything we've worked on for the past 4 months"

Ms. Lloyd said she does not accept that a garage has to be a primary house feature. Mr. DeVellis said he didn't disagree, which is why he's pushed the houses back and added farmer's porches and lots of landscaping. Ms. Lloyd said shared driveways and smaller footprints would make the necessary room for side-loading garages.

Mr. Cohen asked what happens to the width of the houses if there are side-loading garages. Mr. Bernstein said the envelope of the house doesn't change; the garage itself is a 24 x 24 ft. box. Mr. Bernstein said he and Mr. DeVellis tried very hard to accommodate the request for side-loading garages but "the houses were all torqued and it looked horrible."

Ms. Lloyd said the garages could also be pushed to the rear of the lots. Mr. Bernstein said that pushing the garages further back makes it harder to put on a family room or a kitchen. Ms. Lloyd returned to the issue of house size. "I completely understand your economics however, you also got some additional concessions, like the T instead of the cul-de-sac, that affect your cost in a positive direction." Mr. DeVellis said the difference between building a T and a cul-de-sac was not a big savings; The benefit of the T is it's not such a large impact on the land. He asserted the developers were trying to meet everybody's interests. Ms. Mustapich said that an architectural rendering of the units would be necessary to compare the designs. Ms. Lloyd said, while there are people who are interested in buying large houses, that's only one type of homebuyer. "Nobody's addressing other segments of the market."

Starting a straw poll vote, Mr. Cohen said he is not bothered by the larger house size. Ms. Mustapich concurred.

Ms. Hackman clarified that she was interested in smaller house sizes mostly because of the pricing. The smaller homes in earlier versions of the proposal had \$800,000 price tags. "I was interested in having this be more affordable to more people, including downsizing residents of Bedford. \$800,000 is a lot of money but it's 1/3 less than your typical new house in Bedford. I was never that unhappy with the [higher] density but I understand the neighbors weren't happy... There's nothing wrong with attached houses. Those can be made for less. The way houses have been for 50 years is not necessarily the way houses are going to be for the next 50 years".

Mr. Hanegan said he sees the house size represented in the latest proposal as an acceptable compromise.

Public Comments

Richard Madison, 29 Fox Run Road, said he wanted to see a more detailed landscaping plan because the trees on the current plan appear to be pushed back on the south corner of the new road. Also, it appears as though all the current trees in the 50 ft. buffer would be “chopped down and replaced”. Mr. DeVellis said the trees on the south side of the new road are pulled back to provide a good sight distance for exiting cars. The trees shown in the 50 ft. are not intended to replace the existing buffer but to supplement it, as requested by the abutter at 32 Fox Run. The spruce trees on the north side of the new road are likely to stay.

Aaron Bourett, 8 Glen Ora Drive, commented that, from personal experience as a recent home buyer in town, homes the size that Mr. DeVellis now proposes do not exist on the market. “These may be a little bit bigger than some on the Board would have hoped but they do fulfill a niche that you’re not going to find anywhere else...If we decide to say ‘No’ [to the PRD] and go with [the conventional], we’d lose the affordable home.”

Ms. Perry said 614 Springs Road is currently a non-conforming property and should probably go through the ZBA special permit process to formalize its new status, as it will become part of the larger property but keep a low setback. Mr. DeVellis said he believes that putting the existing house property together with the rest of the parcel would make the lot conforming but he will talk to Code Enforcement and/or Planning Staff about this issue.

Motion: Ms. Mustapich moved to continue the Public Hearing to November 15, 2016. Mr. Hanegan seconded. The motion passed, 5-0-0.

BUSINESS ITEMS

Plan signing for Evergreen Meadows Planned Residential Development

Ms. Perry said that instead of a trench alongside Evergreen Avenue, the edge of the road will now be pervious pavement. This is considered a minor change that doesn’t affect the layout of the houses.

Ms. Perry said that Planning is still waiting for easement documents but a letter in hand from Riemer/Braunstein to Mr. Fields, signed by Mark T. Vaughan and dated October 4, 2016, states that the drafts are underway. Also, the covenant is being finalized.

In response to a question about tree clearing from Ms. Lloyd, developer Mr. Melanson and engineer Mr. Carr said they intended to keep as many existing trees as possible.

Board members signed the mylar and paper plans and the mylars were given to Mr. Melanson.

Plank Street (recommendation for street acceptance)

This will appear as Article 10 on the STM warrant and requires a Planning Board recommendation.

Mr. Fields gave a brief summary, explaining that the article is two-fold: 1) Town acquisition by eminent domain of a .45 parcel of land that has been abandoned by a defunct corporate entity; 2) acceptance of 900 linear feet of Plank Street as a Bedford public way. The road starts in Bedford

at Middlesex Turnpike, where the paved route has been shifted as part of the recent improvements, and traverses the Billerica town line, ending in an industrial park.

Mr. Cohen noted there was no place on the draft warrant to include the Planning Board's recommendation for approval/disapproval. Mr. Fields said that would be corrected in the final draft.

Ms. Lloyd asked if the Town had already been maintaining Plank Street, even though it was not yet an official town road. Mr. Fields said the answer to the question was unclear but he understands that Bedford DPW is in dialogue with Billerica DPW about future arrangements. It is unclear whether the Billerica portion of Plank Street is publically or privately owned/maintained.

Motion: Ms. Hackman moved that the Planning Board recommend approval of Article 10. Mr. Hanegan seconded. The motion passed, 5-0-0.

REPORTS/DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

Development Update

It was noted there was not a lot of change to the number and status of pending proposals. However, problems with the Bedford Marketplace redevelopment were identified as a source of frustration.

In a memo from the Planning office, the Board learned that staff had met with the Code Enforcement Director and representatives from the Marketplace to discuss outstanding items such as landscaping between Building B and the parking lot. A sub-contractor made an error that resulted in the building foundation being 2-3 inches too high. This error was compounded when a separate contractor made the parking lot elevation 2-3 inches too low, causing an observable and potentially dangerous discrepancy between the two grades. Now, there is discussion about erecting a barrier to force pedestrians to walk through safe pathways. Additionally, there are landscaping implications that make agreed-upon tree placement impractical and different types of vegetation are now being discussed. The property owner's agent has agreed to resolve all issues. Installation of park benches and bike racks has been promised for this fall.

Ms. Hackman said these problems feel all too familiar and asked what can be done to prevent other occurrences.

Ms. Perry said there seems to be an industry-wide problem with concrete subcontractors. Mr. Fields added that the subcontractors were not working together: the contractor working on the building is not the same as the contractor working on the parking lot. Unfortunately, some tenants were given permission to be up and running before the issue was really caught. Re-grading the parking lot may be a way to solve the problem but could also be an encumbrance on business already operating there. Another solution might be to rebuild the walkways in front of the stores, but entrance thresholds need to be level.

Ms. Mustapich asked if ADA requirements have been met. Mr. Fields said there are two ADA paths between the building and the parking lot and those slopes appear to be up to code. Code Enforcement is thinking of deterring pedestrian movement in affected areas by forcing them to

walk on designated pathways that are graded or creating one in the middle that could be stepped and to put something in between those areas like a fence or a railing. A hedge was discussed as well.

Ms. Lloyd said another issue is that the sidewalk in front of Comella's is "choked down": when the door open, there's inadequate access on the sidewalk between the edge of the open door and the landscaping drop-off.

Ms. Hackman said, "We spend so much time making these developments accessible and this is very frustrating." Mr. Cohen said that poor site/construction management is the problem. Ms. Mustapich said there is no incentive for the different sub-contractors to work together.

Mr. Fields said that the Board doesn't have the power to require the solutions proposed for this development; at this point, the power is instead in the hands of Code Enforcement. In other towns, the Planning Board is the site plan approval authority that signs off on compliance prior to the certificate of occupancy but that isn't currently the case in Bedford.

"We don't have teeth, that's the problem," Ms. Lloyd said. Mr. Fields concurred: "It depends upon the scope of authority Town Meeting has granted you."

Mr. Hanegan said he thinks the Planning Board should ask Bedford Marketplace to correct the problems by re-grading the parking lot, if that is the best long-term solution. Ms. Mustapich asked if Mr. Fields could speak with Code Enforcement to see if the developer will consider re-grading the site. Mr. Fields said he would look into how to address the problems.

Mr. Cohen and Ms. Lloyd said that the general problem of site plan review could be addressed as part of the Great Road zoning initiative. Ms. Hackman and Mr. Hanegan agreed, saying this gap in oversight has played out in several very visible ways in recent high-profile projects.

Ms. Hackman noted that the landscape plantings are scheduled to be completed this fall but, as the season is now advanced, it might be better to wait for spring. Mr. Fields said that, in an average year, October is considered to be a safe month. Ms. Perry concurred and added that it has been agreed that the trees would be planted but the fences/barriers might wait. Mr. Hanegan asked if this revised landscaping would come before the board or if staff would handle it. Ms. Mustapich said she preferred to have the Board oversee it because there had already been deviations from what had been agreed upon.

Ms. Lloyd said she sees far too many vehicles turn the wrong way into the Bedford Marketplace near the Bank of America. A better barrier and/or signage were discussed.

Other items:

- The Great Road Zoning Project kick-off will start with a meeting with RKG Associates at 11am on Wednesday October 19 followed by a tour of the study area at noon.
- Members pledged to complete their Conflict of Interest certification.
- The Council on Aging hosted a public meeting with UMASS Boston Tuesday, October 11 to discuss a \$35,000 needs assessment/analysis of the age 60+ population. Mr. Fields

said the information would be useful but he is unsure if the Selectmen will approve the expense.

- MAPC is hosting an informational session Thursday, Oct 13, 2016 at 9am about ArtPlace America and the grant program of the National Creative Placemaking Fund. Ms. Lloyd may attend.
- Ms. Hackman said the Fall MAPC Council meeting will include a follow-up discussion re: legislative changes that allow greater local control over things like speed limits.
- The next MAGIC meeting is in Concord on Thursday, November 2 at 2:30pm. The focus of the meeting will be legislative priorities.
- The Flavors of Bedford, hosted by the Bedford Chamber of Commerce, will take place Sunday, November 6 from 4-6pm at the Doubletree Bedford Glen Hotel. Tickets are \$40.
- Special Town Meeting will convene Wednesday, November 9, 2016 at 7:30pm. A brief Planning Board meeting will take place beforehand at 6:30pm upstairs in the Bedford Library.
- The Annual Holiday Tree Lighting on the Bedford Common is Saturday, Dec. 3.
- The departmental budget presentation to FinCom is scheduled for Thursday, January 12, 2017.
- The DPW will hold public meetings about the two intersection projects—North Road/Pine Hill and North Road/Chelmsford Rd (Renzo's corner) on October 20th at 7:30.

Liaison Reports:

Ms. Lloyd said the Selectmen discussed Article 9: funding handicapped access to the Sabourin Field press box. A waiver that was filed to provide more time to gather funding will expire and the only options left are to spend \$47,000 on a lift or \$30,000 to remove the press box. The Selectmen expressed frustration that no department or group has stepped forward to fund the lift.

Mr. Cohen said the Chamber of Commerce monthly meeting is Thursday, October 13. Mr. Hanegan will attend.

Mr. Hanegan said that one of the Community Preservation items on the STM warrant—funding for an expiring use consultant for Bedford Village—has been postponed. The 3% surcharge remains (Article 11) as does the continuation of the Bedford Housing Authority Life Management Collaborative (Article 12).

Ms. Lloyd asked Mr. Hanegan to consider providing a per person cost analysis for the Life Management program. Mr. Hanegan said that Gene Clerkin, Housing Authority member and former Community Preservation chair, has these numbers. Mr. Hanegan added that it took some time for public housing residents to understand the program, so participation was slow at first.

Ms. Perry said that planning staff is starting to draft the Planning Board's Annual Report in response to the request from the Selectmen/Town Manager.

Article presentations and recommendations to Town Meeting

Motion: Ms. Hackman moved that the Planning Board recommend approval of Article 11—Community Preservation Surcharge. Mr. Hanegan seconded. The motion passed, 5-0-0.

If Article 11 becomes controversial, Mr. Hanegan will speak about Planning's position of support.

Articles 4,5,6,7 are the Board's zoning amendments. Ms. Perry undertook to draft the Board's reports for Town Meeting. These articles will be presented by Mr. Cohen, possibly together, but voted separately. Ms. Lloyd said she'd be happy to discuss the presentation procedure with Mr. Cohen and provide support as appropriate. She will contact the Town Moderator for guidance on whether to cluster or separate these article presentations.

Ms. Mustapich will deliver the Board's report for Article 3—Temporary Moratorium, Medical Marijuana Treatment Centers.

Mr. Hanegan will voice the Board's recommendation in support of Article 10—Plank Street Acceptance.

MINUTES

Motion: Mr. Hanegan moved to accept the minutes of September 27, 2016 as amended. Ms. Mustapich seconded. The motion passed, 5-0-0.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Ms. Mustapich moved that the Planning Board meeting adjourn. Ms. Lloyd seconded. The motion passed, 5-0-0.

Respectfully submitted,
Kim Siebert, Recording Secretary.